

tics) *Society*, and I am afraid that many regard the *Society* as one for mutual admiration. Actually, I know nothing more likely to influence a man towards eugenics than frank admission of his own inherited defects, or towards Socialism than a tendency to blame anybody else rather than himself and his ancestry.

GUY PORTER.

Mahara,
Upper King's Cliff,
Jersey.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I thank Mr. Porter for his letter because it gives me the opportunity of further explaining my position.

Suffering is the result of two factors—heredity and environment. Pain and disease being undesirable, I am, respectively, a eugenicist and a socialist. To my dismay I find the former attacking the latter. My quarrel with Mr. Porter and the *Society* is that they maintain differential

ability as a justification of our disgusting economic system with its intensifying trade cycle and imperialist warfare.

My communist friends do *not* hold that all men are born equal. Several strongly support sexual and eugenic reform, although doubting its possibility in a world organized and producing only for profit. They would answer Mr. Porter's contention that wealth represents worth by showing how 5 per cent. of our population owns 60 per cent. of the national wealth! Is the Welsh miner or Lancashire weaver worth less than £2 a week?

He rightly accuses me of attempting to reconcile the two reforms. If we add a third, internationalism, we have the great movements which include all other social improvements. In my opinion these three roads converge in Utopia on the horizon.

F. J. ALLAUN.

10, Wilmslow Road,
Didsbury,
Manchester.

